Further Remarks

Upon Mr. GADBURY's

DEFENCE of SCORPIO,

By way of addition, to a just Reward for unreasonable service.

WHEREIN

Not only Mr. *Gadbury*'s Pretensions to Astrology are dissipated; but even his Title to *Learning and right Reason* (which by virtue of his Horoscope he challenges) is shaken.

By the *Man in the Moon*.

Bilem saepe jocus vestri movere tumultus.

Printed in the Year M DC LXXVI.

Further Remarks

Upon Mr. GADBURY's

DEFENCE of SCORPIO,

By way of Addition to a late Reward for unanswerable Scripes.

WHEREIN

Not only Mr. Gadbury's Pretended Astrology are diffected; but even his Title to Learning and Brains (which by virtue of his Horoscope he challenges) is thaken.

By the Man in the Moon.

Dilem Lege joeum scyri mecum ridebitur.

1674.

Printed in the Year M DC LXXIV.

To the Worshipful

Mr. JOHN GADBURY,

Quondam Taylor in Ordinary to Mr. *William Lilly*; now Extraordinary Physician to Her Majesty, and a Secretin to the Peerless *Dulcinea*, otherwise called the *Gardiner's* Daughter.

IT was well observed by one (a Philosopher no doubt, and I am very sorry I have not a Greek Apothegm to express it by, for the honour of you my learned Patron) that when a Dog, though of never so great) valour and courage, happens by the chance of

War to be worried, every whiffling Cur, that before durst scarcely lift his leg before him to piss, will be sure to have a snap at him. But still would I have you comfort your self with your own doctrine.

But Rats in Science, least things ever chuse
To nibble at; that's the base Vermins use.

And though your Enemies rejoyce, and Scorpio *be found to be a very lewd Sign, yet keep as long as you can on this side Hell (as 'tis canted) and exercise nei-*

 ther

ther Knife, Halter, nor Pill. The Lady Dulcinea *is still* in esse, *young & kind, and there may come a time, when you may have* 45. l. *for your five sheets again, be but humble and faithful, and leave off this habit of writing scurrilous nonsence, and I dare engage, you shall conciliate the favour of all Mankind, as much as of*

Your Servant,

The Man in the Moon.

TO THE READER.

Gentlemen,

AS many of you as have read, the *Juſt Reward for unreaſonable Service*, will conclude that my Attempt is but *Actum agere*; and I do but dance after the Pipe of the Author of thoſe ſmart Annotations: I confeſs he hath diſplay'd the moſt principal abſurdities of our Blundering Aſtrologer, yet are there ſome Material ones, which he hath omitted, which you will find in the following Pages. I muſt acknowledge too, had not that Gentle-

man written, you had never seen any production of this nature of mine; For till I by accident saw his reflexions, I had never heard *John Gadbury*'s defence of Scorpio (whence you may conclude that I lived in a Garret too) but observing so much Salt in them, and the great advantage which he had over his Antagonist, I imagined that *John Gadbury*'s Book could not but be very pleasant; so that presently I procured it, and having perused it, being a little idly disposed, resolved to divert my self and you, with what had not been already observed; and if you compare this with the first Annotations, you will find, that I am no Plagiary;

And

And though you find, the *Man in the Moon* in the Title-page, yet am I neither Animal *Cornutum*, nor so Lunatick as a Scorpionist, that (like a Moon-shiny night) barks at his own shadow.

Farewell.

HAd Mr. *Gadbury*'s Annotator designed to have dealt impartially, and (as he pretends) like an unbyass'd Person, he would never so severely have examined the extravagancies of a Man, so long time reputed *non compos mentis*; nor ought he to have taken notice of his inconsistencies and contradictions, in a Book that was scribled in a *delirious fit*; but have cited his opinion of the influence of the Stars, before they had so unhappily exerted it upon his brain, *i. e.* before he was quite infatuated, and turned Mad-man: for in his Preface to his *Coll. Gen.* (particularly that Part that is borrowed from Sir *Chr. Heydon nomine suppresso*) he tells us, *That the Stars do so strongly encline, that the effects of Nature are commonly seen beyond the force of education.* Nay, within these seven years *it pleased God to honour the Stars with such Energy* (which I conceive consists not with *Gadbury*'s inclining) *that among five thousand Nativities, he can with confidence assert, they have never been found to fail*, see Prognost. for 1669. Might not the Title of *Silly Sophister* have been as fully attributed

tributed to him by his Annotator, for excluding the Heirs of Hell from being any part of Gods Creation, becauſe they have no pretence to Heaven, as for endeavouring to prove by a Negative? With what face can J. G. object to Mr. L. his ſtigmatizing Scorpio, when in the groſs he ſo irreverently transfers the particulars of the change on *Sampſon*? But to come more cloſely, *Really, Gentlemen, I muſt tell ye, if ye did believe Mr. Lilly in his black charge to be true, you ought to anticipate his malice, take courage and become your own Butchers, for certainly Perſons of his character, as he ſaith ye all are for being born under Scorpio, can but faintly hope for any ſhare in Heaven at laſt; and then to what purpoſe ſhould we, that are born under ſo diſmal an Aſcendant, covet to live?* Senceleſs Sot! but argued like the Author.

Might not our Annotator have obſerved (had he been unbiaſs'd) that theſe words do moſt apparently convict our Aſtrologer, either of Hereſie, or folly and ſtupidity? I confeſs I am willing to put the faireſt conſtruction upon it, and for once admit it to proceed out of his abundant ſimplicity, and only tell him that he argues like a moſt egregious Aſs: For if he believes a future puniſhment, and by the misfortune of his Horoſcope is incapacitated for pretending any ſhare

in Heaven, it is ſtupendious folly to accelerate thoſe inexpreſſible torments that afflict the damned, by cutting his own throat.

Plato (as quoted by Plutarch) maketh Providence ſuperiour to Neceſſity or Deſtiny; Mr. L. if he allow Providence at all, placeth it below them. But why ſhould J. G. transfer this confounded non-ſenſe upon Mr. L. when it had its conception of his own *Addle-pate*? For I would fain be ſatisfied, how Providence can be imagined by any rational Man, if there be a neceſſity in the diſpoſition of humane affairs? though I doubt not, but our Author can reconcile Fate and Providence as eaſily, as the hooks and eyes of a Suit.

Mr. L. muſt pardon me, I cannot help it, &c. This is the mighty Advocate for free-will, he that would exclude all coercion upon the mind of Man, cannot now help his differing in opinion from Mr. L. and how ſhould a Man, in whom non-ſence and repugnancies are inherent, avoid contradicting himſelf, and writing like an Aſs?

I cannot but commend his prudence (or rather ſubtility, for you know his Horoſcope) in waving thoſe diſputes, which God knows he is no more able to manage or determine than his *quondam* Gooſe notions, which at ſecond or third hand he hath gleaned up, and here ſtuffing in by the head and

ſhoulders, by his hints would be thought a Philoſopher. I cannot but laugh at his Epithet of *prodigious* for Scorpio, there being ſuch a prodigy of Aſtrology, and an *olio* of Saints ſpawned under it, *for you may obſerve, good Reader, Scorpioniſts ſpawn apace.* I would deſire our Author to tell me by what figure of non-ſence he terms that immortality, *which is no longer liv'd than the carkeſs.*

Mr. *L.* (it ſeems) in his Almanack for 1673. hath a little ſeverely reflected upon Scorpio, and Perſons born under it: *Gadbury* in recapitulating the affront, doth not only exert his reſentment, but very wittily (as he thinks) upbraids him with tautology; But would not a wiſe Man have taken care, that he had been ſecure before he had recriminated? But to prove this Coxcomb's pretence by right of birth equivalent to Mr. *Lilly's*, pray read in the very page where he makes this obſervation, and you ſhall find, *This Mundane frame or fabrick is of ſo excellent a texture and compoſure, and is ſo choice and exquiſite a piece of clock-work, ſo glorious and orderly as well in each particular, as in its general motion, that ſhould the leaſt pin or particle thereof be wanting, or amiſs, or indeed in any other nature or temper, ſhape or condition, or in any other order than it is, the whole World would run to ruine or deſtruction.* If ever ſuch

an hideous piece of bombaſt (for bombaſt, if for once you will admit a clench, hath formerly been as eſſential to his profeſſion as filching) was read before in a Fellow, that pretended to reprove tautology in another, I will be bound to read the non-ſence of this Author as long as I live, and I think my life would then be as uncomfortable as a Scorpioniſts, were Mr. *Lilly*'s charge true.

As it is our Author's endeavour in all his writings, to illuſtrate and adorn (as he thinks) his diſcourſes with hard words, ſo hath he no ſmall affectation to lard them with Greek and Latin Verſes: His skill in the Greek is unqueſtionably as eminent as Sir *Hudibras*'s, and for Latin he hath as much I dare ſwear as the Geeſe that preſerved the Capitol; for an inſtance take theſe two (Verſes I cannot call them) as they lye p. 5.

Cunctis ineſt canibus pro conſuetudine natum,
Ut latrare magis quam feritare ſolent.

Here hath our Author outdone the Proverb, killed three Birds with one ſtone, given us a *ſpecimen* of his skill in the Latin, of his Poetick vein, and laſtly girded his Antagoniſt; but would any but our egregiouſly ſtupid Fop, have thus ſhamefully betrayed his own ignorance? Can he think Men ſuch

Sots, as to believe that he who would expose such stuff to the publick, could have any understanding (as he pretends) in the learned Languages? *Seneca*, I remember, hath an expression that runs thus: *Quibusdam canibus sic innatum est, ut non pro feritate sed pro consuetudine latrent.* But because I am sensible he is ignorant enough, not to apprehend the absurdities of his own without some intimation, I will desire him to scan the first line, then construe it and tell of what use *natum* is, and where he meets with the Verb *feritare*, except in his own barbarous Poetry? Yet to convince you further of his skill in the Latin, hath he not in his *Doctr. Nat.* pag. 137. put Woman in breeches, and made her of the Masculin gender, *meriturus ante natum*? what think you of *applicat. ad* ☊ ☿ *Dominus none*? hath not he (to prove his acquaintance with the Poets) discovered *Seneca* to be but a plagiary, and stole that Chorus *Fatis agimur*? &c. which we find in his *Oedipus*, from *Claudian*; as very gravely he cites him for the Author of it, in his Title-page to the Nativity of King *Charles* Astrologically handled. His Annotator has (I think) sufficiently lashed him for his challenge, to produce one Author that hath stigmatized Scorpio. But, saith *John*, if such Authors there be, *they and Mr. Lilly stand in eminent need of Heaven's*

Annostia. But, Friend *John*, have the Heavens a greater respect for Scorpio, than any other Sign of the Zodiack? Or may you alone securely cast what imputations you please upon the Celestial Bodies? For if I mistake not, you charge the Planets ill dignified, (*Vide Doctr. Nat.* pag. 67, 68, &c.) as scandalously as Mr. *L.* doth Scorpio.

Your Annotator hath very justly acquitted Mr. *L.* from your scandal, of believing the Stars to be essentially evil, and impellent causes: But how you will purge your self, I cannot conceive; for by as much as may be collected from expression, I am satisfied that you did believe them to be cogent (however you have now changed that note) when you wrote these words: *If Venus be found in Libra or Taurus, whatsoever the nativity be, the Native shall affect lewd Women, and be shall be a Fornicator. Doctr. Nat.* pag. 80.

And what construction will the subsequent words admit: *And I am perswaded, that whoever have ♂ and ☽ in their nativities* (as of necessity all Persons have) *will be more or less* (according as their dignities therein) *concerned in the question: that is, they will by an innate Impulse, do that which is much worse, Vide Doct. Nat.* p. 130. And now whether these words do not imply a coercion, contrary to the doctrine which he here maintains, I appeal to

any Scorpioniſt in *Europe*. But whether by *much worſe* he means fornication, or *Iſtud quod digitis Gadbury perdis homo eſt*, I cannot determine, but it may be both.

Now for the particular branches of the charge, and the firſt that occurs is *falſity*, and (quoth *John*) *That is the counterfeit of verity according to the etymon; ſuch an one as breaks open Letters*, &c. *if it be wickedneſs to conceal the faults of that which a man ſelleth; ſurely open, publick and profeſſed falſhood is wickedneſs with a witneſs.* Beſides the non-ſence and tautology here, you may obſerve that according to the etymon (as he abſurdly calls it) falſity is the counterfeit of verity, *i. e.* either it hath ſome reſemblance to verity; That eſſentially there is between them, is obvious: and taken in the other ſence, it is a flat repugnance *to open publick*, &c. So that you ſee here is non-ſence with a witneſs; thus doth this ſtupid diſputant blunder in his firſt particular.

Secondly, Arrogance, and there he tells us out of *Solomon: There is more hopes of a fool, than of one that is wiſe in his own conceit, and ſubjoyns that 'tis the greateſt enemy to prudence that can be.* From whence I collect that this *J. Gadbury* is like to be a fool to the end of the play: For, ſaith *Solomon, There is no hope of him.* But this learned Author can't be content to quote a Wiſe Man, but he muſt make him break poor *Priſcian*'s head.

Thirdly, *Ambition is the mother of Superstition*; and yet (quoth he) *vain glory* (which with him *idem sonat*) *ends in lewdness, so that to be ambitious is to live vitiously*: How these cohere I apprehend not, nor it may be the only wise and learned *J. Gadbury*.

Fourthly, *Ingratitude*, and of this was never any Scorpionist guilty; I only desire him to reflect upon himself, and what excuse he can frame, let him know according to his own maxime, *Knavery in one person, is no excuse for ingratitude in another*.

Fifthly, *Boasting, which is a vice* (saith *John*) *opposed to valour*; which by his favour is no consequent, there being so frequent examples of their compatibility. It is wonderful to him, *how boasting falls to the share of a Scorpionist, since Scorpio is the House of Mars and Mars the author of true courage*; and this you have in general, be *Mars* well or ill dignified: *So that a prattler* (which is consisting enough with boasting) *without modesty or honesty, a Broacher of quarrels, a Thief, a perjured or turbulent Fellow, a Promoter of mischiefs, a rash inhumane treacherous Fellow, a meer Incendiary, one that neither fears God, neither cares for honouring or revering Man*, (which is his own character of *Mars* ill dignified) and such a *Mars* as himself was born under, may have as just a pretence to true valour as any, and if so, I see no rea-

son

ſon for the excluſion of the Boaſter.

Sixthly, *Lying*; and here Mr. *Lilly* hath hit it: and *John*, notwithſtanding all the Authors which ſo learnedly thou enumerateſt, thou wilt never be able to acquit thy ſelf from this ſtigma; for certainly thou (if any Man) art according to thy own pretty Phraſe, the very *Coloquintida of converſation*. A *Thief* (ſaith *John*) *is better than a Lyar*. We have indeed a Proverb that ſaith, *He that will lye will ſteal*; and no man doubts, but he that will ſteal will lye: That *John* will ſteal, I can prove by his plagiariſm; that he will lye, by his words.

I could not chooſe but laugh, when I ſaw *lechery* in the ſeventh place, and *John Gadbury* at the beginning; but his learned Annotator (though no Church-warden) hath brought home the brat to his door again, though like an unnatural Father he had renounced it, and expoſed it to the mercy of the Pariſh. Yet ought the Annotator not to have been ſo ſevere, but to have conſidered that beſides the provocations of the fleſh, there was a mighty ſympathy in their Nativities; and that though the Stars are no *impellent cauſes*, yet ſometimes they incline very ſtrongly. In the mean time let Mr. G. tell me, whether in all his Aſtrological reading he never met an Author that (ſpeaking of a Scorpioniſt) ſaith, *Erit talis*

qui ſemper advenereos coitus oculorum cupiditate cogatur? And doth he not remember that his Friend *Firmicus* tells him, that *Lollianus* his own Patron, *Ob crimen adulterii in exilium datus eſt?* yet this *Lollianus* was a Scorpioniſt too.

Eighthly, *Perjury*; I cannot blame Mr. *Gadbury* for being a little on the huff in this paragraph; yet to qualify him a little, let him remember his peremptory character of *Mars* ill dignified; but what then? I can take a box on the ear with leſs regret from my ſelf, than from the beſt Aſtrologer in *Europe*.

Ninthly and laſtly, comes *Revenge*; and he aſſures us that Mr. *L.* hath tryed, *Whether the Scorpioniſts are Pigeon-liver'd, or have any ſuch commodity as revenge; and that he hath rendered Heaven* (for I ſuppoſe he means no more by that enthuſiaſtical tautology, of the *moſt holy Seat of the moſt holy and tremend God, the habitation of the bleſſed Angels, the reſting place of the Faithful, the Church of the Elect*) *a place of horrour and blackneſs, a Deſart of deſtruction, a Source, a Sink, a Seed-plot of all terrene unhappineſs.* Now how prettily theſe fulſome Metaphors cohere, let any Man of ſenſe judge; but it was the zeal, the abundant zeal of our intoxicated Author, that belch'd out this abſurd bombaſt.

I concur with him, that it is very rare *to find a Fool born under Scorpio*; yet I neither

ſpeak

ſpeak treaſon, nor contradict my ſelf, if I affirm I know ſeveral Cockscombs, and particularly one egregious Fop, by name *John Gadbury*.

Again (quoth *John*) *If Scorpio were a Sign ſo bad*, &c. *how comes it to paſs that neither the learned Cardan, nor the ingenious Morinus ſay not one word thereof?* Although the Annotator had not the happineſs to recollect *Cardan*'s and *Morine*'s teſtimonies (for who can retain every expreſſion in ſo many hundred Pages?) yet will it be no affront to him, to obſerve the tranſcendent impudence and ignorance of this pretending Aſtrologian? This is the Man that would be thought to have read *Cardan* and *Morine* ſo accuratly, that no expreſſion hath eſcaped him, or elſe he ſawcily concludes all Men as ignorant as himſelf; and becauſe he never read them (at leaſt to no purpoſe, never underſtood them) no Man hath. But to demonſtrate his ignorance to his indelible ſhame, let him read *Card. Aph.* 55. *Segm.* 2. and he ſhall find, that *Compoſitos & pulchros Aries facit, Scorpius mendaces*, and there I think is one word for him. Again *Aph.* 166. *Segm.* 5. *Aquea ſigna faciunt proditores atque in his Scorpius excellit*, there is another. I will not inſiſt upon *Aph.* 140. *Segm.* 2. *Mercurius maxime hebetatur in ſignis humidis, ſed in Scorpione facit maleficum.* Nor had I cared if he had o-

 mitted

mitted *Scorpius ſolicitudinem animi (intellige denotat) & deceptionem*, becauſe *Morine* comes to my aſſiſtance, pag. 462. Aſtr. Gall. *Quibus aſcendit Scorpio hi ſicut timidiores, prudentiores, ad diſſimulandum aptiores, & clam inſidias iram ſuam explevit ultionibus.* Here is hypocriſie, treachery, revenge and anger; and what will an angry, treacherous hypocrite, that ſtudies revenge, boggle at or not attempt? But *Morine* hath not yet done, for p. 504. diſputing, whether the Celeſtial Bodies are only univerſal cauſes, he hath theſe words: *At prout effecini, hoc eſt, homini vel equo genito particulares confert qualitates, quas nec homo, nec equus conferunt quod nempe ſint a propriis ſigni influentia, ut maligni mores a Scorpione in aſcendente.* For the true underſtanding the queſtion debated by *Morine*, let *Cap. 6. lib.* 21. be conſulted; what I have here tranſcribed, is ſufficient to demonſtrate Mr. *G.* an huffing ignorant pretender. He can't be to ſeek in the ſignification of *maligni eſt*, as his Annotator wittily obſerves, he knows moſt words in *Rider* & *Thomas* too: Yet believing, he may be as perfect in them as in *Morine* and *Cardan*, I would adviſe him to betake himſelf to one of them; and I am confident, he will find no one word that doth more ſignificantly expreſs, or fully comprehend the whole charge, drawn up by Mr. *L.* againſt Scorpio, than *maligni* doth.

But

But how could Mr. G. were he not a Scorpioniſt, upbraid *Mother Shipton*, & the *Sybils*? with what face can he ſo wittily (as he thinks) joke upon him, as if he could produce none but Aſtrologers of his own begetting, to teſtify to his charge?

Haly, an eminent Arabian Aſtrologer, is pleaſed to terme Scorpio an humble and depreſſed Sign. How Mr. Haly, an humble and depreſſed Sign, and yet guilty of perjury, lying? &c. Yes, Mr. G. he is pleaſed to do ſo, and at the ſame time he terms it *deceptor* too; but like a true Scorpioniſt you take occaſion to leave out that. But, upon theſe words of *Haly*, he endeavours to prove ♏ an obedient Sign, and obedience a paſſive quality; and then brings in *Johannes Angelus* and *Firmicus*, to teſtify that it denotes the Native to be *iracundus & agilis*; but how *humilitas* and *iracundia* do conſiſt, I do not conceive.

Our Author need not to have taken ſuch pains, to have enumerated ſuch an heap of Aphoriſms, to prove the influence of ♂ (as we know it) deſtructive and pernicious. Nor do I conceive that, becauſe ♂ is a Planet of a malevolent influence, ♏ is an innocent Sign; and that becauſe thoſe Authors, which he cites, do condemn ♂ his heats, they therefore acquit ♏ from all intemperance. Nor do I care whether ♏, as the Houſe of ♂ or from

any innate vicious quality, does inflict such vices into the Native; yet we know *aliud est fieri & in re, aliud in re*. But let it suffice, that for any thing alledged by our Friend *John*, Scorpionists may be as profligate Raskals, as for *John*'s, and the sake of some others, we have reason to suspect they are. But for the operation of the Signs, either *dependenter a Planetis*, or *per se*, *Vide Morinum c. 4. l. 20.*

Guido Bonatus (it seems) had observed Scorpionists (as I have) to be very great Lyars; and therefore says, that a Person born under ♏ shall be one *In cujus ore vix aut nunquam invenietur veritas*. But, saith Mr. *G.* he can be no more true in this than he that said, *In his heat all men were Lyars*; which is a modest way of giving King *David* the lye: But *Guido* contradicts himself, and therefore no way serviceable to Mr. *L.* saith Mr. *G.* but if *Guido*'s repugnancies do invalidate his authority, then I do pronounce this whole Book of Mr. *G.* in defence of ♏ *ipso facto* null and void, being replear with nothing but flat contradictions, as I think his Annotator hath proved to his indelible shame.

I cannot but laugh at that high-strained piece of experimental Philosophy (as 'tis phrased) so much applauded by *John*, viz. *Campanella*'s pursing himself into a distorted posture, when he was writing to a crooked Cardinal:

dinal: he ought to have put on his Robes too, and in every thing else as near as he could have personated one of that function, and then I believe his fancy might have operated as effectually, as if he had written in his natural posture. I am resolved, if ever I should have occasion to make use of Mr. *G.* I will (as near as I can) put my self into the shape of a Hog, and represent *Epicuri de grege Porcum*; nay, I will imagine Scorpio to be my Ascendant, and then assume my pen, and try *to meet his humour in the thing I write about.*

In the mean time, I am glad there is so compendious a method discovered, for the reconcilement of differences: Put your selves into the frame of your Adversary, send him a Letter; and, quoth *John*, there is *a Period of the contention.*

Our accurate Astrologer (like an insensible Blunderer) is again at Mr. *L.* for contradicting himself, but it is endless harping upon that string: Only let me ask him, what he will prove by producing his twenty genitures? for when all comes to all, he tells you he will prove; but, what? go look, and prudently he evades that; for I see nothing he is like to prove, but himself an Ass.

He is not only offended at Mr. *L.* for bringing in the Natives of *m*; but all Persons that inhabited that part of the Earth, to whom *m*

ascen-

ascended at the Suns entrance into ♈. Yet you shall hear this perfidious Scorpionist himself speak upon the very same occasion. *If ♏ be a Sign of fulfity, as Hermes in the 9th. Aph. of his Cent. affirms it to be, then we may be glad, it is so nearly of the Horoscope at the time of this vernal ingress, &c. a little after; this part of it is the decanate of ☽, & habet significationem ebrietatis bellarum & fornicationis, to all which kinds of evils and debauchery men will much incline, &c.* [See his Judgment upon the year 1669.] With what brow then can this fulsome Astrologer call Mr. *L. Impostor*, and transfer all those Epithets upon him, which Scorpio doth so naturally challenge for its Natives? But, I think, I may as justly (without any violation of truth or breach of good manners) pronounce this *J. G.* an illiterate trifling Scribler, and a bungling Astrologian: the first I have already proved, and the last too in part; but more fully to confirm both, I will examine his twenty examples, at least what hath been by his learned Annotator omitted: And the first that occurs is King *Ed. 3.* of *England*; and it is pity we have him not under the title of Monarch of *Great Brittain*, as (like an Owl) he gives us *H. 8. Edw. 6.* Queen *Mary*, and Queen *Elizabeth*, in his *Coll. of Genit.* But what will he prove by this Nativity? Why, that he was a valiant Prince. Who

denyes it? But will he prove that Mrs. *Alice Pierce* and he, were no more contemporaries than *Dido* & *Æneas*? Or can he justify the Execution of the Earl of *Kent*? But perhaps our Author may reply, the first of these was occasioned by the ☌ of ♂ and ☿. But what then? *All things are subordinate to the Horoscope.* Were that then a sign of that vertue and continence, which he would have us believe, it *might have overborn that single testimony.* Seeing therefore the matter of fact is true, it must be attributed to his Horoscope, according to our Author, who (like a wise Astrologer, but more zealous Scorpionist) tells us, that there is *nothing in this Nativity, but the Horoscope to recommend it to the World*: For, saith he, ☌ *Lord of the Ascendant therein combust, in* ☍ *to* ♄ *and* ☌ *with* ☿ *Lady of the 7th.* But did ever any Fellow argue thus against himself? For what could be desired greater for a Prince, whose design and glory it was to be victorious, than to have the Lord of the Ascendant strong therein, disposing of his Enemies (as ☌ doth of ☿) in ☌ with the Lord of the M. C.? and he must give me leave to tell him, that it is the opinion of some more learned than himself, that an ☍ of ♄ and ☌ makes men successful in War: and of this (were it necessary) I could produce many instances. But if the grandeur of this Native be, to be at-

tributed solely to his Horoscope; why is not that of every Scorpionist? or why is not every Scorpionist as eminent (*quoad capax*, as Astrologers cant) as this Native, and as worthy.

The Electour of *Saxony* is (by the Annotator) very pertinently charged with ingratitude, and consequently with the whole indictment; for *ingratum si dixeris omnia dixeris*. Yet this Electour was a *freeholder of Reason* as well as of his Electourship, and though there was an Antipathy betwixt the Emperour's Nativity and his, yet his reason (one would have thought might have exterminated his vices. But (saith he) *their ambition and particular designs might differ*: observe this conjuring disputant! he undertakes to acquit all Scorpionists from the black charge of Mr. *L.* and here makes no more, but point blank confounds his design, confutes himself, and very wisely charges this Prince (brought by him to give a testimony against Mr. *L.*) with *ambition* a particular branch of the Charge.

I shall observe nothing in the *6th* example, but Mr. *Gadbury*'s Epiphonema, *viz. Kings and Princes are Mr.* Lilly's *tennis balls as well as the Stars, and must be tost'd and struck up and down as he is pleased, to bandy them with his black and envious racket.* Here's a Metaphorical piece of nonsence for you, and is scarcely so good as if he had said, I am a wooden Astrologer

longer made of flesh and bone, and so speak non-sense very elegantly with my pen.

I have too great a veneration for the Royal Family to make any ill reflections (were I able) upon the seventh example; yet can I not omit Mr. *Godbury*'s prevarication, for first he publishes this Lady's Nativity (in that Book where he pretends to exhibit all the genitures of the most illustrious Branches of that Family) and makes ♍ 22. ascend. Afterwards in his *Coll. Gen.* he is ashamed of that Horoscope, and therefore recants, and tells us that the proceeding was erroneous, and that *sine dubio*, that which he there presents us with, is the true one; and in that he places ♎ 27. ascending, and very pertinently gives the Ascendant *ad* ☐ ☿ for the small Pox, of which she expired. Here again like a false and subtile Scorpio-ist, he would perswade us that ♍ 1, 52. did ascend; But what credit is to be given to a Fellow that shall print a Nativity three times variously, especially when it may rationally be presumed, that this alteration is only to accommodate it to his idle purpose? but admitting this to be true, I demand what the Ascendant *ad* ☐ ☿ gave her about 23? I hope a Direction, which he makes fatal if ♑ ascend, shall not pass without effect when ♑ is in the Horoscope: But finding this inconsistency in him, this example

can

can prevail nothing with the Reader to reconcile him to it, when there is greater probability that it was Horoscopical.

I do not conceive that this row of Cardinals, which his Pride produces, do at all contribute to the redemption of his own or Scorpio's credit: For first, he borrows them all from the most uncorrected collection (doate but his own) of one of the most negligent Authors (*J. G.* always excepted) that ever wrote: But then admitting the figures to be true, what he can collect from the words of *Argol.* I apprehend not, he having only pretended to give an account of critical dayes, it being eccentrick from his purpose to mention any thing of their merits. But Mr. *Gadbury* citeems it no small indication of the desert of the first and second Cardinal, whose Nativities he produces, that they had the favour of so great a Man as Pope *Clement* the Eighth, *Who knew well enough how to make choice of Ministers for the Church for Peace and happiness*, saith our Author. Yet you shall hear his opinion of this very Pope, in his Observations upon his Nativity in his *Collect. Gen.* pag. 95. *If this be this Pope's true Nativity (as Argol avers) it seems to me that he attained the Papal dignity more by Policy than desert, and was made the Head of the Church more for necessity than for any Religion.* So that alas

instruments a Pope that had neither desert nor Religion, was like to make choice of, let any Man judge.

The tenth, is a Cardinal with a long name, that flourished under Pope *Paul* the Fifth, *and received according to his worth and merit favours from him: So that you see Scorpio, or Persons born under it, are not so notoriously wicked*, &c. You may observe that Mr. *Gadbury* in all these examples, makes them to have attained their preferments by their merits. But hear him in his calculation of his own Nativity, in his *Doctr. Nat. Seriously protesting that the great reason, why he hath no more honour and preferment* (and what could a witty Astrologer expect or deserve?) *according to the best of his judgment is, because he hath always detested and hated the art of flattery and dissimulation, the ONELI Stairs by which All Persons ascend to honour and preferment.* So that according to the best of his judgment, All these Persons whom he so descants, attained their preferments by no other means but flattery and dissimulation: Thus doth Mr. *Gadbury* lavcily contradict the Astrologer, and makes no more of proving him an Ass, than if he still lived by the Gnose.

In the Nativity of Dr. *Gell* I shall only observe the position of ☿ in ☌ in the *9th*: and quote that Aphorism, which he accommodates

to Pope Clement the Eighth, & in the ninth House ill dignified, denotes an hypocrite or dissembler, makes him heretical and guilty of great errours in matters of Faith and Religion. What can be from hence concluded, but Mr. Gadbury is an hair-brain'd, hot-headed Astrologian, giving his judgment as the toy takes him, or prejudice or favour sway him, and not from any sober and regulated principles of Art.

Regiomontanus is the twelfth, and seeing Mr. *Gadbury* hath taken occasion to dignify him with the titles of learned, judicious, and ingenious, and with *Origanus* stile him *Matheseos vestis*, hear *Cardan* of him: *Monteregius multa sibi ex aliorum laboribus ascripsere, Tabulæ Directionum magna ex parte sunt ipsius* Joannis de Bianchinus *Ital. extant apud me locupletiores, illas Monteregium vidisse constat cum de aspectibus loquitur, epitoma est Mediolanensis cujusdam antequam etiam Purbachius Monteregii magister nasceretur, liber de triangulis Sphericis inventio tota est Hebri Hispani: Ephemerides inventæ sunt antequam nascerentur, habui enim Ephemeridem anni* 1412. So that you see *Cardan* hath almost put out this Mathematical eye, and *Regiomontanus* being thus *furtivis nudatus coloribus*, appears like a true Scorpionist. For, saith Mr. *Gadbury*, *It is as horrid a crime to steal the labours of the dead, as to rob the houses of the living.*

For the account we have of *Regiomont.*, we are chiefly obliged to his own self, and a few parasitical Poetasters: But from his writing I do pronounce him a vain-glorious Ass, and a boasting Astrologer. As any Man will be convinced, that will view his *Tractatus Astrologicus, & de Annis Climactericis*, at the end of both, which Books you may find not only a medly of other mens *Sycophantry*, subjoyned purely for ostentation, but his own vain account of his extraction; which is a thing so childish and ridiculous that a Wise man would blush at it. However, boasting is a branch of Mr. *Lily*'s charge, under which this Person comes, so that this nativity is impertinent as any of the other, and proves nothing in defence of it.

Then for *Angelus Politianus* (whose Nativity follows) he did onely (as your Annotator, Mr. *Gadbury*, observes) say that he never spent his time worse than when he read the Bible, but that reading Saint *Hierom*'s translation, it had made him forget to write good Latin: but in defence of his poysoning himself, it may be alledged that the poor Churchman had got a pocky *Ozæna*, the shame of which drove him him to despair, so that he not only dyed, but had lived like a true Scorpionist. But let me not forget his pride and vanity, which was so eminent that having a

contemptible name of which he was ashamed, he changed it from *Johannes Bassus* to *Johannes Angelus Politianus*; and this was a blessed example (was it not?) to vindicate a Celestial Horoscope?

And certainly when Mr. *Gadbury* recommended this blessed Churchman's Nativity for the glory of it, he was not aware how he betrayed his own ignorance; for before his Works printed at *Basil.* 1553. you may find this Character of him; *Erat dissimulatione simulatione, ubi facie neque animum ingenium & libera, ab omni mendacio, & fallaciis semper invideret.*

The next is *Argol's* celebrated Friend, whom *Argol* gives a very kind Character. Yes, and so he does it too. *Paul. Paru.* pag. 955. *Scorpius facit bellicosos inimicos, improbos, fallaces, seditiosos, malorum omnium.*

Sir *John Cheik* is the next, and as our Author supposes, *Neither Mr. L. nor any of his Tribe, will presume or esteem it a crime in him to have been Secretary of State.* No not they, I dare engage, had not you very unevilly laid Flattery and dissimulation to his charge, the *ONLY* stairs *by which ALL Persons ascend to honour and preferment.*

I have nothing to say against Doctor *Fisk*, only Mr. *Gadbury* was his Pupil; and as he

himself observes, *Qualis Dominus talis Servus*, Like Master like Man.

But of all comes our Author; and to his Nativity I shall onely accommodate an Aphorism of his own (and you know as himself observes all *Aphorisms are indubitably true*) no rule to be found in his Century at the end of his *Coll. Obs. Aph.* 87, ☽ in ☍ to the Ascendent, and ♂ in the same Aspect to the ☉ makes an absolute Knave or Traytor. But replyes *Jobn*, ♂ is in □ to my ☉ if in any Aspect at all; for ☉ is separated nine degrees from him, and ♂ is out of Orbs. But let me ask him one question, why may not I allow as large Orbs as he? For he imputes a kind of necessity to the influence of the ♂ or ♃ and ☿ in *Sforza's* Nativity, who are as far under as from his Horoscope; and though a □ be not so bad as an ☍ yet it is here an Immediate afore it. Admit be as you say, that you never took heed at all about Orbs of the times, yet you pretended to print Nativities, which the Law makes treason to calculate; but who were you, *Jobn*, that should have Orbs imposed you? A Lad, who could have found out a shifting Fellow, that (as your Annotator observes) sat cross-legged all day up in the Garret? But, saith *Jobn*, I am a very surly Fellow sometimes, therefore provoke me not too far; *Howbeit at this time*

I will RULE *my Stars, and* FOLLOW *Jupiter's gentle influence.* Is not this a pleasant Rhetorical Cockscomb? Is is not a cunning way of ruling the Stars, by submitting to their influences? Why could he not with the Poet have said: *I'le follow Fates, which doth too fast pursue.* But it is impossible for our Author not to write non-sence, as it was in the dayes of yore, to patch a Suit without his Goose.

I have now almost run through this mighty Book, nothing remaining but a Postscript, an Advertisement, and his Almanack Rimes in defence of *m*. In his Postscript; I cannot but laugh at his *Posthum'd legacy*, which he shall leave the Sons of Art. I doubt his Printer is mistaken, and it should have been *unposthum'd*, like Cleavland's *Unposthum'd bubble of a brave*, and it may be as much in it. But to leave trifling, saith *John*, let us come to his bouncing non-sence in rime, and when I read his Poetry I do not admire at our Proverb: *A bad a Rimer as an Almanack-maker*: The Jingles foisted, the wearish stuff, and contemptible fancy are enough to make a man renounce Rime eternally. Yet is not this troublesome Fellow ashamed, to reprint these Rimes again in this Pamphlet, as a Corollary to his defence? In his *February*'s Observations you find these words:

The parts of Heaven, are like to Heaven alone,
As Heaven to God, that made it, who's but one.

Which is as much as to say, the parts of Heaven, viz. the Signs, &c. and God Almighty, are very much alike.

And how poor Scorpio being apart, should be
Thus subject to surquedrious raillery,
As to be stiled bad, the whole being good,
It more my wit nor thousands understood.

Though it be not understood by thee, nor thousands as dull as thy self (if so many there be) yet *John* I would have you know, that Men of stronger intellects do comprehend it; and they will tell you, that those parts of Heaven, that are observed to be of evil influence in respect of us (though in respect of themselves and us, they are essentially good) are very properly termed bad, in contradistinction to those that are kind and propitious. Thus is ♏ as properly stiled false and treacherous, and ♑ and ♐ Infortunes, as Hemlock, &c. poysonous and destructive. *For God saw all that he had made, and it was good.* — But surquedrious!

The Goblin makes me ſtart,
I'th' name of Rabbi Abraham, *what art?*
Syriack, *or* Arabick, *or* Welch, *what ſkils?*
Some Conjurer tranſlate.

For I declare I ken it not, but leave it for a pure piece of non-ſence to the Author, to ſee what *Rider* and *Thomas* ſay to it.

Scorpio's a ſign of briſk activity;
And Men, born under the ſame, ſo be.——it.

Here our Poet thought he was praying for the deſtruction of his Enemies; but for the rime's ſake was forced to leave out, *It*, and ſo to make it cry clink, wrote falſe Grammar.

Muſt action then be branded? whiſt my pen,
We'l all be guided by dull ſottiſh men.

I wiſh with all my heart, thy pen would once be ſo dull, or thou ſo ſottiſh as to be whiſt, we ſhould have the leſs noiſe with non-ſence and tautology by far.

What Sign in all the twelve, yieldeth a man
More good, more juſt, more learned than Scorpio?

Theſe run, methinks, like his *Epiphonema*

to

to his wit-enſuring Verſes, to Phantaſtical *Heydon* upon his Temple of Wiſedom. *Viz.*

This I'le preſage, your Book of Wiſedom is
A Guide, that leads to Nature's myſteries.

Now this was like the Coniurers of *Brick-court*, and certainly Poet thou went it to the Divel for this prediction; for did ever Man but thou undertake to preſage a thing that is.

Now for a piece of our Poets Religion, *viz.* A Trinity in unity; *but Pictoribus atque Poetis.*

Under bleſs'd Scorpio happily was born,
Our Engliſh Triſmegiſt, the learned Brown.

And why (thou Gooſe-cap) Triſmegiſt? O yes, he is the greateſt Phyſician, the greateſt Philoſopher, and the greateſt what? Not Prieſt I hope: no, it ſhall be Scorpion, much to the Doctor's reputation. But under favour, doth not the Phyſician come under the notion of a Philoſopher? ſo that for ought I can ſee, the Doctor muſt be content, and hereafter write but Biſmegiſt. But you ſhall hear the complement, our Poet paſſes upon this learned Perſon in another place, occaſionally ſpeaking of him he tells (*Deſcr. of Nat.* p. 130.

p. 130.) *That although he wished we might procreat like trees, yet shortly after* (though he is mistaken, for it was almost, or full seven years after) not being able to contain, *he was so wrought upon by the power of Venus, that he was forced to betake to a comfortable importance.* So that you see Mr. *Gadbury* making lechery the sole motive (or rather incentive) that this Gentleman had to marry, brings him under one branch of Mr. *Lilly*'s black charge before he is aware.

But I am (and I believe, the Reader too) tired with the non-sence and contradictions of this Author, but had they not been displayed, he would have been so insolent and intolerable in his boasts, that he would not only have again confuted himself, but have been troublesome to his Neigbours, and have made such a noise and bluster about that part of Mankind, that cannot with judgment distinguish, and would have concluded that he had really obtained that victory, of which he will find he hath hitherto but dream'd.

FINIS.